"BROCKWAY DROPS HIS MASK." Page 473.

JULY 15th, 1933

VOLUME X

NO 14

COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

TEN CENTS

CONTENTS OVERLEAF

CONTENTS

Number 14

Published fortnightly in Russian, German, French, Chinese, Spanish and English

1. LETTER FROM THE COMINTERN TO THE BRITISH I.L.P.

(*See page 471*)

2. FENNER BROCKWAY DROPS HIS MASK

By W. Kust

(*See page 473*)

3. THE ANTI-SOVIET POLICY OF BRITISH IMPERIALISM AND THE PROTEST MOVEMENT OF THE ENGLISH PROLETARIAT

By Harry Pollitt

(*See page 477*)

4. BRITISH IMPERIALISM, FASCISM AND THE ANTI-SOVIET CAMPAIGN

By R. Palme Dutt

(*See page 482*)

5. LENIN ON THE COMING NEW WORLD WAR

By Madyar

(*See page 489*)

ETTER FROM THE COMINTERN TO THE BRITISH I.L.P.

OMRADES,—We confirm the receipt of your letter of May 18th regarding the resolution opted at the Derby Conference of the Indepen- nt Labour Party, a resolution which undoubt- ly expresses the strongly increasing will to ity and struggle against capitalism among the itish working class.

In conformity with your wishes, we will set t our opinion of how the Independent Labour arty would assist the work of the Communist nternational.

An important step in this direction is the start hich is being made in the practical carrying t of the united front between the Independent abour Party and the Communist Party of Great ritain in the struggle against the capitalist offen- ve, the fascist terror in Germany and the danger new imperialist wars. This in itself is the eginning of practical collaboration with the Com- unist International.

In our opinion the further steps in this direction hould be as follow :

Firstly, the extension and strengthening of the tions of solidarity, which have already taken lace between the Independent Labour Party and he Communist Party of Great Britain to all the mportant and urgent questions of the struggle f the British and the international proletariat gainst their bourgeoisie and world imperialism nd winning of the broad strata of workers, mem- ers of the Labour Party and the trade unions, or the united front in this struggle.

Secondly, the giving of real support to the truggle of the Communist Party of Great Britain gainst the bourgeois nationalist and reactionary olicy of "National Labour," against the reform- st policy of the Labour Party leaders, the leaders f trade unions and the Second International.

Convinced by the experience of many years, the nembers of the Independent Labour Party decided t the Derby Conference to follow up disaffiliation rom the Labour Party, by leaving the Second nternational. These two decisions were neces- ary and important steps in the struggle against eformism. But the Independent Labour Party annot stop merely at the point of an organisa- ional break with the Second International.

If the Independent Labour Party has seriously lecided to participate in the revolutionary class truggle of the proletariat, it cannot carry this out xcept by a constant active struggle against 'National Labour," against reformism, and the eformist leaders who propagate reformist ideas, old back and disrupt the working-class move- ment.

In practice, the slogan of struggle against the capitalist offensive remains an empty phrase if the party which advances it does not take any steps to mobilise the workers for mass resistance to wage cuts, dismissals, the reduction of unemployment insurance, etc.

But the Social-Democratic parties and the reactionary leaders of the trade unions, who state in words that they are opposed to the capitalist offensive are, in reality, directing their efforts towards permitting the capitalists to carry through their merciless pressure on the workers, without meeting with any resistance.

The members of the Independent Labour Party know this from the experience of Mondism, and also from the actions of the "Labour" government, which reduced unemployment relief, carried through wage cuts, introduced "economies," etc.

In exactly the same way *the struggle against fascism* remains a hypocritical phrase, if it is not accompanied by the organisation of the united front of the working class with the aim of barring the path of the fascist attack from the very beginning.

But in every country the parties of the Second International, including the British Labour Party, are doing everything in their power to hold back the majority of the workers from participating in the united front, with the Communists, for the struggle against the bourgeoisie and fascism.

By their policy of collaborating with the bourgeoisie, and by their policy of splitting the united front of the working class, the parties of the Second International are building a road for fascism.

Before the eyes of the workers of all countries stands the example of German Social-Democracy. Under the slogan, "Against Fascism and Against Communism," it consistently supported every reactionary government in Germany on the plea that it was the "lesser evil" as compared with an open fascist dictatorship, and in this way it restrained the masses from the struggle against the fascist danger.

At the same time it attempted to show the exploiters by means of all kinds of concessions to the bourgeoisie, at the expense of the workers, that they had no need to replace the "democratic" constitution by a fascist dictatorship in order to carry out their policy of attacking the standard of living of the toilers.

All the repeated and insistent attempts of the Communist Party of Germany to call on the workers for solid anti-fascist activity, to form a united proletarian front of struggle, were dis-

rupted and betrayed by Social-Democracy and the leaders of the reformist trade unions. In this way they succeeded in paralysing the efforts of the Communists to mobilise the majority of the working class for mass resistance to fascism (demonstrations, political strikes).

The other parties of the Second International, and the trade union leaders of the Amsterdam International, who are connected with them, follow the same path as German Social-Democracy.

Similarly *the struggle against imperialism and the wars which it is preparing* remains an empty phrase in the mouths of those who do not honestly and insistently strive to mobilise the working class for an irreconcilable struggle against the imperialism of its "own" country.

But the parties of the Second International are themselves infected through and through with the ideology of bourgeois-chauvinism and are interested in the success of the robber policy of their own imperialism. Just as the Social-Democratic parties in every country support their governments during the war, so are they now supporting the bloody suppression of the colonial peoples and other independent nations, and the policy of preparing new wars.

In those cases when a Social-Democratic Party forms part of the government, it directly carries out this violent imperialist policy of the bourgeoisie (bloody repression in India, and the bombing of unarmed populations under the Labour government).

Also, in the struggle between the capitalist countries and the *Union of Soviet Socialist Republics,* the parties of the Second International have really joined in the anti-Soviet front of the capitalist world.

Therefore, there cannot be any question of really serious support for the struggle of the Communist International against the capitalist offensive, against fascism, imperialism and the menacing war danger if, at the same time, the harmful rôle of the reformists and their hostile policy towards the working class are not exposed, and if a struggle is not carried on against them at every step.

If the Independent Labour Party wishes to help the struggle of the Communists against the bourgeoisie, and their chief social support in the ranks of the working class—the Second International, it will give real assistance to the development of the working-class movement.

But if any representative of the Independent Labour Party supposes that the deep divergence of principle between the Second International and the Communist International could be covered up by an unprincipled rapprochement and conciliation, we openly announce that this would be a most harmful delusion and an impermissible mistake from the point of view of the interests of the class struggle and the proletarian revolution.

The Second International is not acting for but *against* the class struggle of the proletariat; not for but *against* the proletarian revolution.

The members of the Independent Labour Party must clearly understand that the chief danger of the Second International consists precisely in the fact that, while representing the interests of the *bourgeoisie,* it does not do this *openly,* but under the cloak of defending the interests of the *workers.*

If a party like the Independent Labour Party, instead of exposing the real nature of the Second International, were to depict it as a genuine representative of the workers, to which the revolutionary workers' organisations could and should reconcile themselves, it would, by this, merely make the deceptive manoeuvres of the Second International easier to carry out.

If the Independent Labour Party were to renew the harmful attempts which it made after the war, together with several other parties, to act as an "unbiassed" intermediary between the Second and Third Internationals, and if individual leaders of the Independent Labour Party were to write articles hostile to the revolutionary working-class movement (such as the last article written by Fenner Brockway), this would not be *support* for the Communist International, but for the Second International.

In practice, such attempts would be an obstacle on the path towards the establishment of the proletarian united front and the unity of the working class on the basis of the class struggle. That was the rôle of the Two-and-a-Half International, which held back the revolutionary development of the radicalised workers, so as to return them once more to the fold of the Second International.

What relations can be established now between your party and the Communist International?

Our opinion is as follows: Although the Independent Labour Party does not at present accept the standpoint of the programme of the Communist International, nevertheless, it can establish really revolutionary collaboration both with the Communist Party of Great Britain, and with the Communist International.

We on our side declare our complete readiness for such collaboration, but, of course, retaining the right of comradely criticism when necessary.

In Great Britain there is a very great necessity for the uniting of the revolutionary forces. We see at present that many members of your party are studying the programme of the Communist

ernational and advocating a united revolution-
party. This is of serious importance.
f the members of the Independent Labour
ty are really developing in the direction of
pting our programme, then possibilities open
n Great Britain for the formation of a single,
ng, mass Communist Party corresponding to
conditions of the country.
We are facing the greatest fights in the history
he world. A historic transition is taking place
new cycle of revolutions and wars. The class
ggle is rapidly growing in all capitalist coun-
s. The antagonisms in the camp of the
erialists themselves are intensifying.
he picture of the capitalist world discloses the
plete bankruptcy of the capitalist system. At
same time the construction of socialism in the
S.S.R., with its mighty economic, technical and
ural upsurge, shows that as soon as the work-
class organises its forces, overthrows the
atorship of the bourgeoisie and shakes the
italist parasites and exploiters from its
ulders, then before it opens up the path for a
at creative work in all branches of life.
n many capitalist countries the revolutionary
look opens up this possibility of proletarian victories. The forces of the proletarian world revolution are growing. In all capitalist countries it is the Communist Parties which are carrying on a determined struggle for the interests of the proletariat and for the cause of the socialist revolution.

In Germany, in spite of the raging fascist terror, the Communist Party with great self-sacrifice is successfully carrying on the struggle, and without doubt will show to the whole world that it has rallied around the banner of the proletarian revolution, not only the five million workers who voted for it at the last elections, but *the majority of the working class of Germany.*

If the Independent Labour Party energetically assists the struggle of the Communist International, this will be of great international significance.

We request you to inform us whether your Party agrees to give precisely such support and assistance to the Communist International.

Yours fraternally,

(Signed) O. W. KUUSINEN

(*For the Secretariat of the Executive Committee of the Communist International*).

FENNER BROCKWAY DROPS HIS MASK

By W. RUST.

ENNER BROCKWAY, the Chairman of the Independent Labour Party, has now made it pletely clear ("New Leader," June 16th) that he nds to fight against the majority of his own mbers, who decided at the last annual conference ake steps to "assist in the work of the Communist ernational." Instead of carrying out this resolu-n, Brockway uses his position as Editor of the ew Leader" to make ridiculous accusations inst the Comintern, and to advocate the idea of a w "international" of a special brand.

Although the article is entitled "Workers Prepare," ockway is so enraptured with his "case" against the mintern and the Soviet Union, that he only ntions the united front of struggle against capital-n in passing, in order to convey the impression that Comintern is pursuing an ill-intentioned "excep-nal" policy in Britain and that the C.P.G.B. itted to split the trade unions only because it was weak !

"It is clear that an exceptional policy (with an ceptional purpose behind it) is being pursued in tain by the Communist International. Elsewhere old disastrous tactics are being maintained."

It is unlikely that the members of the I.L.P. will e this twaddle about the united front very seriously, but it would be, perhaps, necessary to repeat that the entire Communist International is fighting for the building of the workers' united front of struggle against capitalism, and the C.P.G.B. will continue with this work unswervingly shoulder to shoulder with the members of the I.L.P.

Already at the time of the Derby Conference, leaders of the I.L.P. were darkly hinting that both the Second International and the Third International were responsible for the victory of Fascism in Germany and now, with an impartial wringing of his lily-white hands, Brockway, who only left the Second International two months ago, explains why this is so. He even goes so far as to make the astounding accusation that the policy of the Soviet Union, the land of Socialist construction, is helping capitalism ! With a splendid disregard for facts, this renowned pacifist cites, as his proofs, the two recent outstanding examples of the Soviet Union's peace policy, namely, the prolongation of the treaty with Germany and the offer to sell the Chinese-Eastern Railway. According to Brockway "We have reached a further serious stage in international Communist policy. Its policy in the past has been one of the factors which have brought Fascism rather than the socialist revolution in Germany and other parts of

Europe. Now the Communist International is pursuing the disastrous logic of this policy. Because there has been no Socialist revolution in Germany and elsewhere, because Soviet Russia remains the one Socialist country, the policy of the Communist International has become so concentrated upon what it regards as the interests of Soviet Russia that it is seriously compromising revolutionary policy in other parts of the world.

"Take the German situation. Communist policy contributed to the victory of Hitler. Then, when Hitler triumphed, the first Government which made a treaty with Hitler was the Soviet Government—the Berlin Treaty completing the financial and economic agreement. Because of this economic co-operation between Russia and Germany, the Communist International has opposed an international working class economic boycott of Germany, the one possible method of overthrowing Hitlerism during its early period of economic weakness."

Unfortunately for Brockway's "case," his long-delayed attack on the Treaty of Berlin is made just at the moment when the German Fascists have proclaimed their interventionist plans in the infamous Hugenberg Memorandum. Are they not striving to provoke the Soviet Union into a false step by every means, and brand her as an aggressor, and opponent of peace? And if, for the time being, the maniacal rulers of Germany are still compelled to continue friendly relations with the Soviet Union—this is no victory for them, but an enforced recognition of the strength of the Socialist Republic, and the success of its peace policy.

But if the Soviet Union should not conclude economic treaties and non-aggression pacts with capitalist countries, why does Brockway himself advocate a trading agreement between the Soviet and the National Government? Are the Conservatives and diehards friends of the Soviet Union? But possibly Brockway, who is not adverse to British capitalists making some profits out of Soviet trade, will argue that Britain is not yet a Fascist country and therefore trade is permissible. Why, then, does Brockway denounce only the Soviet relations with Germany and not those with Fascist Italy or Fascist Poland?

The Chairman of the I.L.P. does not hold very consistently to his new-found principles regarding Soviet foreign and trading relations. Singularly enough, he makes exceptions precisely in those cases where it suits the interests of British capitalists, who are in friendly relations with Poland, but hostile to Germany's militaristic aspirations and anxious to see her completely lined up in the anti-Soviet front. And although the British-German interventionists have failed so far, it is not because of lack of assistance from the Second International, the parties of which conducted a furious campaign against the prolongation of the Berlin Treaty, and did everything in their power to discredit the Soviet Union and undermine its peace policy. (The campaign was actually initiated by the organ of the Austrian Social-Democracy, the Vienna "Arbeiter Zeitung.")

On the other hand, these very parties are in raptures over the successful signing of a Four-Power Pact between the imperialist Powers. Let every worker think over why it is that the Social-Democratic Parties viciously denounce the Soviet Union for prolonging its treaty with Germany for ensuring peace, but enthusiastically greet a pact between France, Britain, Germany and Italy. Obviously, a pact between these heavily-armed capitalist Powers whose "disarmament" conference is their own condemnation, cannot be for peace but for war.

Brockway states that "The Russian acquiescence in Japanese imperialism in the Far East, by its recognition of Manchuko and its offer to sell Japan the Chinese-Eastern Railway, is a second example Russia does not want war. That one understands. But international working class opposition to imperialism must not be sacrificed even to the interests of Russia." Does Brockway really want the readers of the "New Leader" to believe that he, the editor, does not know that this offer was made precisely as a new demonstration of the peacefu policy of the U.S.S.R. to hinder the organisation o provocations against her by Japan?

Brockway, who does not devote a line in his article to the exposure of the Four-Power Pact, or against the embargo of the British diehards, is openly joining in the anti-Soviet campaign on the Second International. He writes against "both internationals" and asks for a "new mind and will," but on the vital question of war and the Soviet Union he is already standing with both feet in the camp of the Second International.

All of his protestations about the importance of an economic boycott against Fascism serve Brockway very little. If he is so eager for the fight, why did the I.L.P. refuse to be represented at the International Anti-Fascist Congress in Paris? Also, in his enthusiasm for the boycott, which would merely have the effect o certain German markets falling into the hands of the capitalists of other countries, Brockway calmly overlooks the mighty force which, day in and day out is waging a merciless struggle against Fascism. Brockway will have his readers believe that the German Communist Party is dead. "The blunt truth is," he writes, "that the international working class movement has collapsed before the fact o Fascism in 1933, just as it collapsed before the fact o war in 1914."

With a lofty impartiality he announces that "both the Labour and Socialist International and the Communist International have been proved bankrupt

policy and action by the Fascist triumphs in rmany."

You are wrong again, Mr. Brockway, it is only the cond International, to which you belonged, which s collapsed.

Brockway tries to prove his "case" by the simple thod of ignoring the Communist Party of Germany, Party which has never shown any signs of llapse, either before, or after, the Hitler dictator- p. Under the leadership of the Communist Party, revolutionary workers fought against every step vards Fascism. The Communists struggled inst Bruening, Papen and Schliecher when the cial-Democrats were welcoming those Govern- nts as "lesser evils" than an open Fascist dictator- p. The Communists organised the street fights the workers against the armed bands of Fascism, y organised the united front in action—strikes and ghty demonstrations.

To day the illegal Communist Party is leading the ly fight of the masses against Fascism despite eous persecution and repression. Its illegal wspapers are spread everywhere, organising and ding the fight, its leaflets are flooding the big tories, and revolutionary workers are not afraid to nonstrate on the streets.

Brockway often claims that the I.L.P. is revolu- nary, but is it carrying out one fraction of the ivity of the Communist Party of Germany ?

Brockway's lying picture is nothing but an attempt conceal the rôle of the Second International, which ne carries the responsibility for the advance of scism to power. According to Brockway, whose npartial" article is practically 100 per cent. against Communists, "compromise had rusted the chine of the German Social-Democratic Party" l therefore it collapsed. Compromise ! Brockway tainly lets his friends off very lightly. The policy the "lesser evil," the voting for Hindenberg which in Hitler, the open voting for Hitler in the ichstag on May 17th is not "compromise," but wnright treachery, Mr. Brockway.

A party which fights against the revolutionary ited front, specifically rejects the proposals of the mmunist Party, and joins in a united front with oitalist Governments, thereby splitting the working ss, is a party of betrayal, an accomplice of Fascism. ne very disorganisation of the workers' ranks, used by this policy, encouraged the Fascists to engthen their attack.

Brockway lets off his Social-Democratic friends th a caution, but he pours out all the vials of his ath on the Communist International, on the ounds that "It shared in the destruction of the ssibility of effective united working class resistance Fascism by splitting the trade union movement, and treating the Social-Democrats as no less the enemy than the Fascists."

Has Brockway forgotten that the German Social-Democrats, like the British Labour Party, began the split in the workers' ranks, by supporting the imperialist war in 1914, and collaborating with the capitalist class ever since ? Workers who fight for a class policy are always called splitters by the reformists, just as the Labour leaders called the I.L.P. workers splitters when they broke away from the Labour Party last year. The only and actual splitters are those leaders who bureaucratically imposed their policy of defending capitalism on the trade unions and expelled thousands of members who led the fight against it.

Brockway is also indignant at the Comintern's estimation that Social-Democracy belongs to the Fascist camp. Why the tears ? After the rejection of the Communist proposals for united front action, after the unanimous Reichstag vote for Hitler and after the advice given by the Social-Democrats to the workers to participate in the Hitler May Day, there is little need to argue about the rôle of Social-Democracy. Still, Brockway must be corrected on one point. The Comintern never treated the Social-Democrats as no less the enemy than the Fascists, but always drew a clear distinction which showed the rôle of Social-Democracy as Social-Fascists, pace-makers for Fascism. Moreover, the Comintern always stood for a united front of struggle with the Social-Democratic *workers* and strove to unmask the policy of the leadership, which was concealed with socialist phrases.

Brockway's boasted impartiality is really nothing but an attempt to save the face of the treacherous Social-Democracy by slandering the Comintern. To conceal the fact that only the Second International has collapsed and that the Communist International continues to lead the mighty struggles of the working class throughout the world.

What sort of "new mind and will " is this ? There is nothing new in this attempt to conceal the rôle of reformism. It is merely the old, old position of "left" leaders, who mouth such phrases to hide the fact that they belong body and soul to the reformist camp. Brockway has proved himself to be nothing else than a servile apologist for the Second International. (Hardly a fitting rôle for the chairman of a party which proclaims itself to be revolutionary !)

Brockway concludes his article, which was written immediately after he had attended a conference of "left" Socialist Parties in Brussels, with the declaration that :

> "These problems indicate the need for an international socialist policy which shall break with the past policies of *both* the internationals."

This is Brockway's way of stating that he is

opposed to a fighting alliance with the Comintern, as decided upon by the I.L.P. Conference, and that he is out to form a new "international." Judging by the composition of the associated Socialist Parties it will hardly be a two-and-a-quarter, let alone a two-and-a-half International! Of the seven parties, only the Norwegian Party can claim any sort of membership, the German Socialist Labour Party liquidated itself even before the Hitler coup, while the Italian Socialist Party is nothing but a figment of the imagination.

Is there any I.L.P. worker who thinks that the cause of Socialism will be advanced in Britain, or any other country, on the basis of Brockway's so-called platform? Such a platform, based on the view that the "International working class movement has collapsed," would isolate the militant I.L.P. workers from the Soviet Union and the fighting Communist Party of Germany, and rob them of any revolutionary perspective; by its attack on "both internationals" it causes confusion regarding the differences of principle, and conceals the real rôle of reformism as a capitalist ideology which paralyses the struggle of the working class; it is a barrier in the way of those workers who are moving forward from reformism to Communism.

Thus Brockway's "impartiality" is again revealed to be a means of hiding the real character of the Second International, and assisting its counter-revolutionary activity.

In Britain, Brockway's "new mind and will" can only have the effect of undermining the united front; firstly, because his attack is aimed against the Communists, who are in the front ranks of the united front struggles, and secondly, because he comes to the rescue of the British section of the Second International, the Labour Party, which is viciously sabotaging unity and co-operating with the National Government (e.g., World Economic Conference, Indian Constitution, etc.).

British reformism is following the same path as German Social-Democracy, even to the point of advancing the slogan of "Against Fascism and Against Communism." Brockway's formulae are not contradictory—but merely a variation of this line. He obligingly recognises the class struggle in words, but he condemns the activities of the parties of the Communist International, the only parties which lead the fight, and his censure of Social-Democracy is made only in order to give some plausibility to his repudiation of revolutionary policy.

Thus, at the very moment when the capitalist offensive against the workers, especially the miners and unemployed, is intensifying, Brockway covers up the rôle of the leaders of the Labour Party and trad unions, who are trying to cripple the fighting powe of the workers by preventing the building of th united working class form of struggle, and b deluding them into relying on the so-called demo cratic parliamentary institutions which, as German proved, serve to cover the dictatorship of the capita ist class, and to prepare the way for open Fascis dictatorship.

Finally, it is necessary to ask, how does Brockwa manage to write this article without a single referenc to the decision of the Derby Conference of the I.L.I to assist in the work of the Communist Internationa The members of the I.L.P. should demand an answe to this question, and they should seriously think ove the position of the chairman of their party, who s flagrantly violates majority decisions, and whos methods and policy are so harmful to the workin class movement.

Brockway did not speak on the C.I. resolution a Derby. Was it a diplomatic silence? It seems t have been a method of silent opposition, as he ca hardly claim that facts have changed since ther The Derby Conference took place after the coming o Hitler to power, after the passing of German Socia Democracy to the camp of Fascism, and after th Labour Party had rejected the united front. Indeed it was precisely these facts that led the membershi to take their fighting decision.

There is no avoiding the conclusion that the view expressed in Brockway's article were also held by hir at the time of the Derby Conference, and that he le the Second International from expediency, and no by conviction.

In the light of the situation created by Brockway article, we ask the members of the I.L.P. the followin questions:

1. Has the resolution of the Derby Conferenc been annulled or not?
2. If not, why does the Party chairman dare write against it, and, instead of showing ho co-operation shall be carried out, begin organise a fight against the Communist Inte national?
3. What will be the political line and the pr gramme of the two-and-a-quarter Inte national, and who will be in it?
4. Is it the job of the British workers to suppo the attack on the international revolutiona labour movement?
5. Will Brockway's article help, or harm, th building up of the united front in Britain an in other countries?

HE ANTI-SOVIET POLICY OF BRITISH IMPERIALISM ND THE PROTEST MOVEMENT OF THE ENGLISH PROLETARIAT.

By HARRY POLLITT.

HE National Government which came to power argely on the basis of its demagogic promises to le work and wages for all British workers, has nly been unable to fulfil its promise, but every its policy has only served to increase the misery e working masses, as the capitalists have pted to find a way out of the crisis by their s upon the conditions of the working class.

duction does not show an increase in any of the industries, unemployment has steadily grown the National Government came into power. alleled mass misery is to be found everywhere. arge industrial centres, and mining districts are, y truth, graveyards of capitalism.

marked is the contrast between the conditions workers in the oldest capitalist country in the , and the conditions obtaining in the Young Union, that, more and more, is this contrast g to accentuate the radicalisation of the British ng class, and develop a widespread realisation ne solution of the problems facing the workers nly be achieved along the path of the October ution.

the efforts of the British capitalist class to solve sis by the usual peaceful methods, i.e., changes netary and fiscal policy, lowering of workers' urds, speeding up in the factories, have not ed them to regain their lost markets or establish nes. Therefore this whole policy to-day is one verish preparations for new wars and armed ention against the Soviet Union.

ere was never such a period of mass misery on ne hand, and such lavish naval, air and military ys, pageants and tattoos, on the other, as at the nt time. The savage cutting down of all forms xpenditure on social service and increased diture on armaments; the character of the h "Disarmament" proposals at Geneva, all the rapacious character of the war policy of the nal Government as a burning reality.

it is in relation to the Soviet Union that its war has perhaps been more openly expressed. National Government has encouraged and rted every anti-Soviet manœuvre and policy nas been sponsored by any imperialist Power. tendency to form an anti-Soviet bloc, has been ly welcomed by the National Government. country, following a policy, the result of which e either concealed intervention, or open war on the Soviet Union, has received the complete endorsement and support of the National Government.

In this connection, its support of the policy of Japanese imperialism has been most marked and consistent. One has only to recall the comments on the events in the Far East of many important capitalist newspapers in Britain about "Japan being a bulwark in the Far East against Bolshevism" and "Japan fighting for civilisation against the barbaric menace in the East." These references are sufficient to indicate the mind of the diehards of the ruling class of Britain. The reception given, for example, to Von Papen's proposal for a bloc against the Soviet Union, when he came into power in Germany in August, 1932; the Four-Power Pact initiated by MacDonald and Mussolini in Rome in the early months of this year. Alongside these tendencies, of course, is to be noted the significant fact that, in Parliament, every encouragement was given to all kinds of insolent questions with reference to the Soviet Union by the diehard Tories. These things all show the strong anti-Soviet campaign being carried through under the leadership of the Tories, screened by the cloak of the National Government, a campaign which has assumed a stronger character than at any time since the period of armed intervention in 1920.

Then came the Moscow trial of the British engineers and, at once, the hounds of intervention were in full cry. The Tory papers and Tory clubs seethed with indignation at the so-called insult to British citizens, and demands flowed thick and fast from all bourgeois quarters, not only for the breaking of trading relations, but the severance of diplomatic relations. There was never a time, since the intervention period, when the anti-Soviet campaign reached such a strong point as during the period when the British engineers were under arrrest and on trial. Day after day this anti-Soviet barrage was kept up. Every newspaper and avenue of public opinion was brought into play to support this campaign, but it had little effect upon the working class. Indeed, as a matter of fact, when the publication of the various interviews was made which had taken place between Comrade Litvinov and Sir Esmond Ovey, the British Ambassador in Moscow, and Comrade Litvinov informed the latter gentleman that " he was not talking to Mexico," it created a delight amongst the working class that it is difficult to recall any other expression having achieved. This expression is now known in every workshop, trade union branch and

workers' home in the country. It was realised that it expressed the strength of the Soviet Union and emphasised that there was one socialist country in the world which could speak without any diplomatic language to the oldest and most presumptuous imperialist country in the world.

Of course, it is now a matter of history that the National Government utilised the Moscow trial to put the anti-embargo measure through its packed House of Commons. A Government which had made play of its desire to find work for the unemployed, revealed its real face when, to carry forward its policy of preparing for armed intervention against the Workers' Socialist Fatherland, it deliberately resorted to the weapon of the embargo on trade with the Soviet Union, and placed 60,000 British workers out of work.

At once this Act aroused a storm of protest throughout the working class movement. The Communist Party initiated a big campaign against the embargo. The United Front Agreement reached between the C.P. and the I.L.P. contained an important point on the need for organising the fight against the embargo, and proposed to organise a national campaign for the withdrawal of the Embargo Act. The Friends of the Soviet Union, which had been rapidly growing in influence and strength for a long period, played a very important rôle in the anti-embargo campaign, which also reflected itself in the composition of the May Day delegation to the Soviet Union, which included a worker from Metro-Vickers.

Meetings, conferences, demonstrations, etc., were organised all over the country. The Friends of the Soviet Union issued a special leaflet for distribution at 105 factories which had either worked on orders for the Soviet Union in the past, or were actually doing so at the time of the embargo. The following extracts will show the character of this leaflet, which had a signal effect in many of the factories, leading to the workers holding meetings and passing resolutions, demanding the withdrawal of the embargo :—

"The 'National' Government has put an embargo on Soviet imports. In reply, the Soviet Government had stopped all trade with this country. That means millions of pounds worth of orders and business lost to Britain."

* * * *

"You have worked on Soviet orders. You know that they have kept scores of works and mills open, and given employment to thousands. Now all this has been lost. More must go on the dole. More children must go hungry."

* * * *

WHY THE EMBARGO ?

"They tell you it is 'to save the British prisoners in Moscow.' A LIE ! An innocent British girl was hounded to suicide by the third degree meth of the American police (in the Lindbergh baby ca The British Government did nothing."

* * * *

"They tell you it is 'to stand by innocent m A LIE ! Thornton and Macdonald have c fessed they were guilty of wrecking plant, brib and spying."

* * * *

"They told you 'the sentences are bru A LIE ! Thornton and Macdonald will be a to work at their profession at trade union ra Every day's work will mean a day's remiss And what about the Meerut prisoners senten to ten and twelve years' transportation for 'crime' of organising the Indian trade un movement ?

"Thornton and Macdonald are only a pret The capitalist class of this country seize on pretext for attacking the first workers' republic

* * * *

"They broke off the Trade Agreement October. When their spies and wreckers w arrested they broke off trade negotiations. W the sentences were barely announced (not confirmed), they imposed the embargo. T they carried out their pledge to the big Canad wheat, timber and fur trusts—and to the Bri bankers and merchants interested in Canad business—which was made at Ottawa. The n step will be to break diplomatic relations, a prel to WAR."

A further letter issued by the Friends of the So Union in 100,000 copies also clearly explained meaning of the British embargo on Russian trade

"The Government has put an embargo on go coming from the Soviet Union. None of the c imports, such as timber, petroleum, butter a grain, are to be allowed into the country."

This means that all exports from Britain to U.S.S.R. will also stop. Soviet Union, in her o interests, must buy where she can sell. So Soviet Union have replied to the embargo wit counter-embargo.

That is to say, trade with the U.S.S.R. amount to £29,000,000 last year, will come to a comp stop.

HOW WILL THIS AFFECT YOU ?

It will mean *Higher Prices.*

It will mean *More Unemployment.*

It will mean *increased Danger of War.*

THE EMBARGO MEANS UNEMPLOYMENT.

Example No. 1.

More than half of the total exports of Brit machinery tools go to the Soviet Union. T

ndustry will thus be cut in half. The Govern-ment are deliberately throwing thousands of ngineers out of work.

Example No. 2.

Every ton of machinery exported from Britain neans more than a ton of steel has been smelted, iving employment to blast furnacemen, steel melters, etc. To make a ton of steel nearly four ons of coal have to be used, and the mining of the oal means employment for miners. All this work s lost by the embargo.

The Government is thus throwing tens of thousands f steel workers, engineers, miners and transport orkers on the streets.

The Communist Party issued leaflets, many of our l organisations displayed considerable initiative getting out special types of leaflets, in accordance the concrete situation in their localities, which ved an important part in the mobilisation of the king class against the embargo.

As a result of the campaign thus started, working s organisations began to adopt resolutions nanding the withdrawal of the embargo, all ealed the growing indignation of the workers.

Up to date, we have record of over 300 such olutions being adopted, and of course, this ludes those which were sent to the *Daily Herald*, bour Party and Trades Union Congress, and these certainly be recorded in some hundreds. It is eresting to note the character of the organisations ich adopted resolutions of protest. For example, Scottish Trade Union Congress, at its Congress April, representing all the organised trade unionists Scotland, passed the following resolution :—

"This Congress registers its emphatic protest gainst the action of the National Government in lacing an embargo on the import of U.S.S.R. roducts, realising that this means, (1) depriving housands of workers of employment in this ountry, (2) it is a deliberate attempt to destroy ocialist development in Russia, (3) it is dictated y the decisions of the Ottawa Conference rather han by the trial of the British engineers.

"Congress therefore pledges itself to work and ight for the raising of the embargo as speedily as ossible."

The following trades councils also adopted similar olutions : Manchester and Salford Trades Council; ptford ; Croydon ; Newcastle ; Grangemouth ; adford ; Middlesbrough ; Liverpool ; West Ham ; icester ; and Farnsworth.

In the trade union branches, resolutions againt the bargo were passed by the following organisations : xtile Workers, Boilermakers, Amalgamated Society Woodworkers, Furnishing Trades Association, ansport and General Workers' Union, including Busmen and Dockers, the National Union of Railwaymen, the Associated Society of Locomotive Engine-drivers and Firemen, the Lightermen's Union, the Amalgamated Engineering Union, the Miners' Federation of Great Britain, the Building Trades Federation, Electrical Trade Union, General and Municipal Workers' Union, the National Society of Painters, Chemical Workers' Union, the National Committee of the Amalgamated Engineering Union, representing the whole membership organised in the Amalgamated Engineering Union, Shop Assistants, Clerical Workers, Distributive Workers.

In addition, the following organisations at various meetings had resolutions adopted of a similar character : National Unemployed Workers' Movement, I.L.P., Labour Party, Communist Party, Friends of the Soviet Union, Co-operative Guilds, Labour Women's Guilds, the Congress of the Co-operative Union, and at mass meetings all over the country similar resolutions of protest were recorded.

The Women's Co-operative Guilds Jubilee Congress, attended by over 1,600 delegates from every part of Britain have unanimously adopted a resolution condemning the embargo "as a step nearer to war."

It is a very significant fact that an analysis of the whole of the resolutions shows that the embargo is recognised as a step towards armed intervention and war.

It is interesting to note that in certain bourgeois circles hostility was manifested to the breaking of the trade agreement and important town councils, like Cardiff and Oldham, went on record against it, and in other areas, local chambers of commerce demanded the withdrawal of the embargo.

It is very significant, in connection with the campaign of the British working class against the embargo, that the stronger the diehards organised their campaign, the stronger became the working-class reply. But, as usual, the reformists of the Labour Party and the Trade Union Congress helped the diehards in their demand for the release of the British engineers, as can be seen in the following telegram, which was sent to the Soviet Government by the Joint Council of the Labour Party and Trades Union Congress :

> "British organised labour, industrial and political, appeals to the Soviet Government for the immediate release of fellow countrymen in the interests of friendly relations between Great Britain and Russia."
>
> (Signed) Walter M. Citrine, Arthur Henderson, George Lansbury.

But this infamous telegram did not represent the opinions of the British working class. Their opinions are recorded in resolutions which were immediately adopted on the publication of the telegram of the Joint Council of the Labour Party and

Trades Union Congress. For example, the Nottingham Trades Council declared :

"This meeting raised strong objections to the actions of the National Joint Council in asking for the release of the British engineers guilty of attempting to ruin the work of Socialist construction.

"This action misrepresents the opinion of the organised workers.

"If Thornton and Macdonald were released, it would serve to encourage parties interested in destroying workers' dictatorship in the U.S.S.R. We uphold the findings of the Soviet court."

The Newcastle Labour Party declared :

"That this delegate meeting entirely dissociates itself from the decision of the Executive Committee of the Labour Party and the Trades Union Congress requesting the release of the British prisoners in Moscow, who were charged and found guilty of wrecking and sabotaging socialist construction in Soviet Russia."

"We declare that such enemies against Socialism in any country are deserving of the utmost punishment. In endorsing such acts, the Executive Committee does not reflect the general membership."

These are the expressions of opinion which can be accurately stated to reflect the real opinions of the workers of Britain. In point of fact, it would be impossible to discover anyone in any factory, trade union branch, or travelling in bus, tram or tube, during the proceedings of the Moscow trial, who heard British workers defend the British engineers. On the contrary, it was common to hear such expressions as : "They're guilty all right," or "The Soviet Government would not dare to have arrested these engineers unless they had the goods on them." And when the trial itself began, and the concrete facts of the wrecking activities were published, then the class instinct of the British workers was strongly displayed. So much so, that when the actual sentences became known, the general impression in working class circles was that the British engineers had got off very lightly, and in many meetings questions were asked by the workers, in which they protested against the light sentences that had been inflicted. On many, many occasions, workers very pointedly asked why "There had been any differentiation made between the sentences of the Russian and British culprits."

There can be no doubt that the strength of the working class fight against the embargo has made itself felt.

The Communist Party has set itself the aim of still more intensifying the anti-embargo campaign, so as to bring in wider circles of the working class, and to get the campaign organised to take a more definite and concrete form. Particularly significant is the intensification of the struggle in the localities and districts, so that the opposition to the policy of the embarg and armed intervention can be brought home to eve section of the ruling class and their supporters.

District conferences are being organised by th Friends of the Soviet Union. The delegation workers who visited the Soviet Union in connectio with the First of May celebrations, are alread engaged in a wide reporting campaign, which receiving the greatest attention and support.

In London on July 30th, 1933, there is to take pla a great national anti-war demonstration. In th demonstration the question of the fight against t embargo was to occupy a prominent place.

After this article had already been written, became known that the undertaking of the Briti Government of the embargo on imports of Sovi goods had ended in failure. The Government foun itself compelled to raise the embargo, and to propo the resumption of negotiations for the conclusion o new trade agreement with the U.S.S.R. The caus of the retreat of the British Government are thre fold. In the first place, the Soviet power exhibit in this conflict a stability and firmness which was n anticipated by the diehards, who had already mi calculated in regard to the Soviet power more th once. In the second place, the British bourgeois suffered a much greater loss as a result of the embarg to which the Soviet power responded by counte measures, than did the Soviet power. In t circumstances of the sharpening economic w between Great Britain and the U.S.A., and also th between Great Britain and Japan, business circles Britain began to increasingly express their di satisfaction at the additional difficulties create their trade by the embargo. In the third place, an this is of decisive importance, the protest of the ma of British workers against the embargo increase continuously.

The Communist Party has done, and will do everything possible to assist in the development this broad movement of working class protest. Ther have been many weaknesses in the campaign, such a not reacting quickly enough to the menace offered b the Tory diehards, and perhaps in not explaining th significance of the breaking of the trade agreemer with the actual preparations for armed interventio and in not having harnessed the resolutions of prote into more concrete forms of mass action.

The question of the embargo has now bee removed by the British Government itself. But th by no means removes the question of the organisatio by the British Government of intervention against t U.S.S.R.

The Four-Power Pact, which is directed against t Soviet Union ; the friendship and admiration whi is being expressed in many official quarters for t bloody regime of Hitler ; are also important indic

tions that the ruling class will give full support to all those plans of Hitler's, designed for the dismemberment of the Soviet Union, and the giving of new territory to Germany at her expense. Significant enough, in this respect, was the attempt made by the more responsible capitalist newspapers to minimise and disguise the significance of the demand made by Hugenburg, the representative of Hitler at the World Economic Conference, for a more active policy against the Soviet Union, and particularly its claims for the seizure of Soviet territory.

The British workers understand the international significance of the policy of the fight for peace conducted by the Soviet Union. They note with pride and enthusiasm that the toilers of the Soviet Union utilise every day of the breathing space to work upon the solution of the great historical task of building the Socialist society. In the fact of the conclusion by the Soviet Union of pacts of non-aggression with a series of countries they perceive, above all, her growing strength.

The speech of Comrade Litvinov at the World Economic Conference, in spite of its boycott in the capitalist Press, is reaching larger and larger sections of workers, and the contrast between the positive and constructive character of this speech and those of delegates of capitalist countries, in which is sharply revealed the differences that exist between the dying capitalist world and the advancing world of Socialism, has made a very deep impression.

This amazing contrast between the country which was anxious to place orders for millions of pounds worth of goods, as compared to all the capitalist countries who, as a result of the impoverishment of the mass, could not find markets for their goods, has been very quickly reacted to by the British working class.

Perhaps it would be as well to close this article with two quotations, because they indicate, not only the desire of the British working class for the resumption of full and unconditional trading relations with the Soviet Union, but are of more deeper revolutionary significance. They are a real appreciation of what the Soviet Union means to the working class not only in Britain, but all over the world. In the declaration of the First of May delegation on its return to Britain, we read :

> "The idea sedulously circulated by the Press that the (Metropolitan-Vickers) trial was held for the purpose of diverting attention from the alleged economic failure of the Soviet policy, we can only characterise as arrant nonsense."
>
> * * *
>
> "The success of the Five-Year Plan is plain for all to see. This is a fact of which every Soviet citizen and every unbiassed visitor to the U.S.S.R. is aware.
>
> * * *
>
> "We are satisfied that in the Soviet Union the real power resides in the hands of the workers—politically, culturally, economically and socially.
>
> * * *
>
> "We shall work to build up the organisation of a fighting united front of the working class under a militant leadership for the purpose of transforming the defensive struggles of the workers into a struggle for the overthrow of capitalism and the creation of a Soviet Britain."

And the quotation from the resolution adopted at a meeting of London Boilermakers where it declared :

> "We send greetings to our Russian comrades and pledge ourselves to fight against this war policy of the National Government and for the fullest possible trading relations between Britain and the Soviet Union."

These are the expressions of opinion that represent the indissoluble bonds of international class solidarity between the Russian and British workers which will enable them jointly to overcome all their class enemies.

BRITISH IMPERIALISM, FASCISM AND THE ANTI-SOVIET CAMPAIGN

By R. Palme Dutt.

THE bloody domination of Fascism and its foreign policy in Germany has given new life and hope to the British anti-Soviet campaign.

From the first moment of the accession to power of Fascism in Germany, British imperialism has shown the utmost activity in endeavouring to use the new situation in Central Europe in order to build the united imperialist front against the Soviet Union for a war of intervention, with a Fascist Germany as the immediate weapon of attack in the West, and the Japanese attack in the East. This policy has shown itself in the Four-Power Pact negotiations, the real driving force of which, despite the nominal Italian origin and sponsorship, has been British policy throughout; in the breaking of trade relations with the Soviet Union through the imports ban; and in the Japanese aggression in the Far East.

The British Labour Party has seconded and assisted this campaign by an ideological campaign of war preparation against the Soviet Union under the slogan "Democracy versus Dictatorship."

Although the conflicting interests of the imperialist Powers have placed many obstacles in the way of the realisation of the British aim, the provisional signing of the Four-Power Pact in June, even in its present modified form, is a step in this direction. The abandonment of the embargo by Great Britain does not mean a change in principle of the policy of the MacDonald Government. It merely bears witness to the fact that that form of anti-Soviet activity is recognised to be inexpedient at the present moment. Sharp vigilance is needed against sudden moves in the future to consolidate the interventionist bloc of Powers, and force the situation to the point of war.

The united working class front against Fascism and the offensive of capitalist reaction is necessarily, at the same time, a united front against the menace of imperialist war on the Soviet Union, which is rendered additionally acute by the temporary advance of Fascism.

I.—THE FIRST STAGE OF THE BRITISH OFFENSIVE—THE FOUR-POWER PACT NEGOTIATIONS.

The National Government in Britain since its formation in the autumn of 1931, has worked consistently towards a break with the Soviet Union.

In February, 1932, the National Government broke off the debt negotiations with the Soviet Union. Captain Eden, Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs, stated in answer to a question in the House of Commons on February 8th, 1932:

> "The whole aspect of Anglo-Russian relations is under consideration."

In this answer was revealed the preparation of the National Government in the spring of 1932 for a wider break with the Soviet Union, if a favourable situation could be secured. Britain was giving diplomatic and material support to the Japanese offensive in the Far East. In April, 1932, the Four-Power Conference was held in London on British initiative. In June, 1932, von Papen, the open protagonist of a united war of western imperialism on the Soviet Union, was placed in power in Germany. In June, 1932, the Lausanne Treaty was signed, and the accompanying Pact of Mutual Confidence. The signs of increased consolidation of a united front against the Soviet Union were very strong.

This attempted attack in 1932 broke down on two main grounds. First, the growth of the conflict with the United States over the Far East, as well as over the debts and Ottawa, hindered too open support of Japan. Second, the situation in Germany was not ready. In the second half of 1932 the Fascist forces were sinking in Germany, and the Communist forces were rapidly rising, as shown in the September elections and the Berlin transport strike. The attack on the Soviet Union was postponed.

From the moment the Fascist dictatorship of Hitler was seen to be firmly established in Germany, British imperialism, in the person of MacDonald, hastened forward to greet the accession of the gangsters, and open a new era of foreign policy in close association with Hitler and Mussolini.

The sequence of dates is here important to note.

On March 6th the outcome of the Nazi terror elections "confirming" the régime in Germany, was known.

Immediately on March 7th the decision was announced of MacDonald and Simon, Prime Minister and Foreign Secretary of the National Government, to take the unusual step of a joint journey in Europe, to Paris, Geneva and possibly further, for the purpose of overcoming the deadlock at Geneva, drawing together France and Germany, and possibly, it was hinted, securing a common meeting of the four heads of Governments—MacDonald, Daladier, Mussolini and Hitler.

The attitude of the British Government to German Fascism was made sufficiently clear when MacDonald, explaining the motives of their journey to the House of Commons, on March 23rd, 1933, declared:

> "It is perfectly plain to everyone that national life is being revitalised in Europe."

"National life is being revitalised." Such were the remarkable terms in which the National Government in Britain went out of its way to hail the advent of the pogrom régime of Fascism in Germany, which even arch-Conservatives out of office, such as Sir Austen Chamberlain and Churchill, were at the same time describing, for their own purposes, as "savagery" and "tumultuous insurgence and ferocity."

On March 9th MacDonald in Paris opposed the French demand that the Nazi arming of the Storm Troops as auxiliary police should be regarded as a violation of the Treaty of Versailles. Britain appeared already as the protector of Fascist Germany.

On March 12th to 16th, MacDonald, at Geneva, elaborated the British "Disarmament" Plan for the increase of German armaments and the reduction of French armaments, leaving the British untouched. In his speech to the League of Nations Assembly on March 16th, he proclaimed :

> "Either Germany is given justice and freedom, or Europe will risk destruction."

Thus MacDonald, who, as Prime Minister, had been in control of British foreign policy for four years since 1929, only suddenly became aware of the urgent necessity of "justice and freedom" for Germany, the moment after Hitler was in power. The liberal bourgeois "Economist" sharply criticised the "blunder" of this partiality of MacDonald for Fascism (8th April, 1933) :

> "It was a blunder to open up the question of treaty revision precisely at a moment when the forces of reaction had triumphed in Germany, and thus to promise concessions to Hitler, which had been refused for a decade to a democratic and peaceful Germany."

It was, of course, no "blunder," but the consistent expression of British policy, aimed at the drawing of Germany into a western orientation by promises of concessions in the way of "revision," in order to form the anti-Soviet front. The relations of the ruling Conservative Party of the British bourgeoisie, whose puppet MacDonald is at present, and the Nazis had already been close for years.

Finally, on March 18th, after an attempt to secure a meeting at Geneva of MacDonald, Daladier, Mussolini and Hitler had failed, took place the meeting of MacDonald and Mussolini at Rome, and the announcement of the Four-Power Pact project.

The Four-Power Pact project has been officially presented as of purely Italian origin, the child of the brain of Mussolini, with British concurrence. In fact, however, the project reflects the continuous British policy. As far back as the period of Locarno, the battle of the pact and the protocol reflected, in corresponding forms, the struggle of the British and French systems of domination in Europe. In April, 1932, Britain led the Four-Power Conference at London, which ended in failure. In November, 1932, the British Government officially proposed to the French, German and Italian Governments a Four-Power Conference to lead to a common understanding, but the project broke down in the face of French opposition. *The Four-Power line was in fact the continuous British line long before "Mussolini's plan."*

From the outset the decisive and underlying character of the Four-Power Pact was an anti-Soviet Pact, covering its basic anti-Soviet aims under the misleading slogan of the "revision" of Versailles, the real aim being to add to Versailles a new Brest-Litovsk. This anti-Soviet aim was directly visible in the Fourth Article of the original draft, laying down a "common line" for Western imperialism "in all questions political and non-political, European and extra-European."

Bourgeois Press comment widely recognised the anti-Soviet aim. Mussolini's organ, the "Tribuna," stated the aim with deliberate openness "to rid the world of Bolshevism."

> "If it is necessary to defend ourselves from the evil which finds its fullest expression in Russia, but which has also struck Western civilisation, as a result of which all nations are compelled to defend themselves from within, then is such defence possible without the co-operation proposed in Mussolini's plan ?
>
> "The time has arrived to recognise the value of the Fascist ideas of Mussolini, not only at home, but also in the international arena."

But, for the success of the Four-Power Pact, it was necessary, first, to overcome the opposition of French imperialism, which, in antagonism to the German rising claims, had been drawing into closer economic and political relations with the Soviet Union, and of the lesser States in Eastern Europe, at whose expense the so-called "revision" would be likely to be conducted. This was the task to which British policy now set itself.

II.—THE SECOND STAGE OF THE BRITISH OFFENSIVE—THE BREAKING OF TRADE RELATIONS.

The feverish activity of British foreign policy in March, expressed in the journeyings of MacDonald and Simon and in the building up of the Four-Power Pact, should be brought into close relation with the parallel activity on a world scale.

On March 13th the embargo on the export of arms to Japan and China was raised. The embargo during its fortnight of existence had been no more than an empty gesture, since masses of war materials had already been supplied to Japan, and "existing contracts" it was explained, were to continue to be fulfilled during the "embargo." But it had served a "moral" purpose in covering up Britain's too open rôle as principal war supplier of Japan ; and its

removal, announced as justified by the lack of international co-operation, was equivalent to an announcement that full speed ahead could now be adopted with impunity for arming Japan for the next stage of warfare. That this next stage of warfare was likely to be no longer only against China, but against the Soviet Union also, was freely expressed in the British Press.

At the same time, alongside these general preparations on a world scale, it was necessary for the British Government to take the lead openly, and find suitable grounds in order to pick a quarrel directly with the Soviet Union and prepare a break. What were these grounds to be? The old grounds of "propaganda" were stale and could hardly be used again at this point. On economic questions, fulfilment of contracts, etc., there was no possibility of making a complaint. The debts question had been assiduously nursed for a long time already as a suitable ground (British Government statement already in spring of 1932); but now, when Britain was engaged in most anxiously urging America to recognise the inability of Britain to pay its own debts, the theme had become highly unsuitable to raise.

British imperialism solved this problem by a step of singular, though characteristic, coolness and simplicity. It seized the occasion of a trial of its own spies in Soviet territory, caught and self-confessed, to make the bare fact of this trial, independently of the charges and the evidence, a case for a breach.

On March 12th the Metro-Vickers engineers were arrested. Immediately, the British Government took a stand (Baldwin's statement of March 15th that the Government is "convinced there can be no justification for the charges") which revealed that the British Government was not concerned with the truth or otherwise of the charges, nor with the most elementary requirements of international law between sovereign States, but was solely concerned to use the trial as a pretext in order to prepare the ground for a future break.

It may be noted that the Foreign Secretary, Sir John Simon, in his speech in the House of Commons on April 5th, in introducing the Embargo Bill, betrayed, in one passage at the end, that the Bill had not, in reality, been prepared solely with reference to the trial. He said:

> "What is the real difficulty? We may just as well face it. It is that owing to the constitution of Soviet Russia, owing to the fact that the State, the Government, is the sole purchaser and the sole buyer, the application in a trading agreement of what is called the 'most-favoured-nation clause' is distorted and ridiculous. Russia has it in its power to stop any goods going from this country to Russia, and she can do that without any breach of the 'most-favoured-nation clause,' because the only importer is the Russian State."

Therefore, he asked the House "to give the Government the power which the Soviet Government has got at this moment." Here, for one moment, the long hypocritical lamentations on behalf of the arrested spies are forgotten, and the real issue peeps through. The real enemy to be struck at is revealed as the Soviet trade monopoly.

The unlimited violence and poison of the Press campaign let loose in connection with the trial bore a character only comparable to war-time. The extent of this can best be measured, not merely from the frenzies of the jingo Press, but still more from the language at this period, even of the left-liberal "Manchester Guardian" with its reputation, normally, of a more balanced judgment, and even of a relatively "sympathetic" attitude to the Soviet Union. This journal produced, at the beginning of April, an editorial on "Russia," which described the Soviet regime as

> "a boundless, brutal despotism. . . . The only remedy for all their ills is terror";

and continued with the direct threat of approaching overthrow:

> "The Russian people is inured to pain by long experience, is without the means or power to organise. It does not ask for much from those who govern it. But history has shown that it does not endure for ever." ("Manchester Guardian Weekly," April 14th, 1933.)

Such was the language of this journal, which had once won fame by its printing of glowing accounts from progressive correspondents of the meaning and achievements of the Bolshevik Revolution. From this the depth and universality of the war-hysteria which was let loose in Britain against the Soviet Union by every channel of bourgeois influence, can be measured.

The Labour Party and its Press, in essence, assisted the National Government's campaign.

Lansbury, leader of the Labour Party (stated in the House of Commons debate on April 5th) expressed the viewpoint of the Labour Party:

> "They did not agree with dictatorship methods, whether they were the methods of Mussolini, of Hitler, or of Stalin. . . . *The difference between the Opposition and the Government was simply one of method.*"

The common basis of "democracy," as the united front of the National Government and the Labour Party against the Soviet Union, against the revolutionary working class, is here briefly expressed.

The Labour Member of Parliament, Logan, though not speaking as an official representative of the Labour Party, declared

> "He was not satisfied with the treatment these

men had received in Russia. Although he was a member of the Labour Party, and anxious and willing to do his bit, the Russian Government was not his standard of democracy. . . . *To him the Communist system was diabolical. It was antagonistic to the most progressive measures of mankind, and the sooner it was got rid of the better.*" ("Times" report, April 6th, 1933.)

Logan's speech was praised by the entire bourgeois Press as "the best speech of the debate," "an honest English expression," etc. And with reason. This Labour Member of Parliament had said aloud for the Government and the bourgeoisie, what they were thinking, what they were wishing the mass of the nation to think, but what they did not dare to say directly. "The sooner it was got rid of the better."

On April 19th, the British embargo on Soviet imports, covering 80 per cent. of previous imports, was proclaimed. The significance of this step was not merely as a declaration of economic war, but as an economic war, in which the political aim of injuring the Soviet Union was openly adopted, even at the expense of direct injury and loss to British economic interests (the Soviet market was Britain's only rising market and the British machine-tool industry had become dependent as to 80 per cent. on the Soviet market). It was still more a direct lead internationally to a general boycott, leading the way to a general political break.

On April 19th the British embargo was proclaimed.

On April 20th Japan launched its ultimatum against the Soviet Union over the Chinese-Eastern Railway.

The confidence and aggression with which British imperialism let loose its campaign of provocation against the Soviet Union in March-April reflects its belief in the favourable international situation which it judged itself to have secured through the victory of Fascism and the provisional adoption of the Four-Power Pact (the French Ambassador in Rome, Jouvenel, had also favoured the Pact, and was only later to be disavowed).

But already in April it became clear that the path of advance would not be smooth, and that the fate of the Four-Power Pact was uncertain. The tangle of contradictions which followed, both between Britain and France and between Britain and Germany, and also between Britain and the United States, and even between Britain and Japan, prevented a rapid following up of the offensive delivered in April.

III.—THE COLLAPSE AND REVIVAL OF THE FOUR-POWER PACT.

The essence of the Four-Power Pact in its first form, as brought forward in March, was the specific inclusion of "revision" of the treaties (Article 2) as the definitely formulated price to win Germany and Italy into a common front with the Western Powers.

But this project left out of account the interests of French imperialism, and, still more, of Poland and the Little Entente States, at whose expense revision threatened to be carried out.

The opposition of these rapidly made itself. French expression was openly hostile. Poland and the Little Entente were in a frenzy of anger and suspicion. Rapid interchanges passed at Paris (Titulesco visit). It was clear that the Four-Power Pact, in its original form, could not go through.

On this development British opinion rapidly took alarm. Britain could not afford to break directly with France ; the British-French Entente and Versailles still remain the continuous basis of British policy in Europe, despite all the intrigues with Germany and Italy to weaken French hegemony. This alarm was all the greater since the wave of nationalist feeling in Germany unloosed by the Nazi propaganda showed signs of not being confined, as intended, to the eastern direction, but of also directing itself against France and even against the British colonial monopoly, for instance, the Hugenberg plan for the return of the German colonies in Africa.

A brake had now to be placed on the forces that were being unchained. Hence arose the series of prominent and emphatic warnings of the "Elder Statesmen," Sir Austen Chamberlain and Grey, as well as of the leading Conservative outside the Government, Churchill, against the dangerous tendencies of the new Germany and the menace of a too-open policy of "revision," and reaffirming friendship and close alliance with France. Chamberlain denounced the revival of "the worst of the All-Prussion imperialism" amid the applause of Parliament. Churchill declared : "Thank God for the French Army ! " The "revision" tendencies and "secret diplomacy" and friendliness to Fascism of MacDonald were sharply criticised by these high priests of Conservatism and friends of Fascism, not out of any hostility to Fascism, but solely through the immediate conflict of the interests of British imperialism against German (it was hinted that MacDonald had even discussed the cession of Tanganyika to Germany). Amid the thunder of these speeches (especially the House of Commons debate of April 13th) the Four-Power Pact passed for the time out of the picture.

The effect in Germany was an immediate widening of the distance between Germany and Britain. This showed itself in the renewal on May 7th of the German-Soviet Treaty.

At the same time difficulties were gathering for British policy outside Europe.

Between Japan and Britain sharp commercial antagonism was developing, the raising of the tariffs on Japanese textile exports to India 75 per cent. and

the threat by Japan to respond by a boycott of British goods.

Still more between the United States and Britain a difficult situation was developing.

On April 19th the United States passed off gold, thus delivering its supreme offensive against British pound depreciation, and timing it to coincide with the arrival of MacDonald.

Not only that, but the possibility of the United States recognition of the Soviet Union came strongly to the front. This was further indicated in the direct delivery of the Roosevelt Note of May 16th to the Soviet Union.

For all these reasons a delay developed in the British offensive plans against the Soviet Union.

Nevertheless, British diplomacy at once got to work to rebuild the shattered projects. For this purpose two steps were essential.

The first was to establish closer contact with France in the re-shaping of the Four-Power Pact. This process was carried on in a series of negotiations in Paris during May and the beginning of June.

The second was to exercise a moderating influence upon Germany, and draw Germany back into a Western orientation, for which it was not necessary to expend much labour since in external affairs the political course of the Fascist dictatorship remained sharpened against the Soviet Union. For this purpose combined threats and promises were brought into play. The signing of the German-Soviet Treaty on May 7th was answered by an official menacing speech on May 11th, no longer of statesmen outside the Government, but of the Minister of War, Lord Hailsham, directly threatening "sanctions." Rosenberg, on his mission to England, at the same time was received by the Foreign Secretary, and fully instructed as to the British viewpoint on how Germany should act. On May 13th Rosenberg returned with his lesson.

On this basis the situation was ripe for the revival of the Four-Power Pact. The offending clauses were revised. All assurances were given by Britain to France, which in turn gave its assurances to Poland and the Little Entente. The Little Entente finally declared satisfaction with these assurances.

On June 7th the revised Four-Power Pact was initialled at Rome.

The revised Four-Power Pact is given in its published clauses the maximum possible harmless appearance. Neither "revision" of treaties, nor the "common line" in "European and extra-European questions" any longer directly appears. Subordination to the League of Nations is reaffirmed at every point to meet the French demands. Article 4 is toned down into the make-believe innocent form of "consultation" on "all economic questions which have a common interest for Europe, and particularly for its economic restoration" (a clause sufficiently elastic to be easily capable of development to anti-Soviet aims).

It is, however, sufficiently obvious that the Four-Power Pact, if ratified, represents a definite diplomatic grouping of the strongest European imperialist countries directed in a significant degree against the Soviet Union. Certainly, the contradictions between the Powers will continue, and may render it ineffective. But, undoubtedly, if it is a question of the imperialist British Government, the aim of British policy will also in the future consist in attempts to get together an anti-Soviet bloc, leading up to a war of intervention.

This policy is continued a stage further at the World Economic Conference. The anti-Soviet aim was openly proclaimed by the Canadian Prime Minister, Bennett :

> "It is not without significance that one of the delegates representing at least one-twelfth of the world's population has proclaimed from this platform that the cause of the disaster is the capitalist system itself. That is a challenge to the rest of the world. From this common ground we can advance together to recovery."

Even more direct was the Hugenburg Memorandum, which undoubtedly expressed the policy of the German Government :

> "The second measure would be to place at the disposal of the ' people without space ' new areas in which this energetic race could settle colonies and carry out great works of peace. . . . War, revolution and internal disruption have found a starting point in Russia and in great areas of the East. This destructive process still goes on. Now is the moment to stop it." (Hugenberg.)

The general increase of the power of the U.S.S.R., the strengthening of its international position and stability, exhibited by it in the conflict ; the extreme intensification of the trade and currency war between the U.S.A., Great Britain and the countries of the "gold bloc" as well as the growing dissatisfaction among the masses of the British working class against the policy of the embargo—all this caused British imperialism to retreat anew, giving up the embargo. It is obvious, however, that this retreat bears the character of a compulsory manœuvre. British imperialism is awaiting the onset of more favourable international weather conditions for the activisation of its anti-Soviet policy. *The intensity of the crisis hastens the tempo of development.*

Against this the working class of the world needs to be prepared.

IV.—THE LABOUR PARTY WAR PREPARATION CAMPAIGN —"DEMOCRACY OR DICTATORSHIP."

Parallel to the campaign of British imperialism for the organisation of the anti-Soviet front goes the

Labour Party ideological campaign of anti-Soviet incitement, which is now reaching an extreme character.

The victory of Fascism in Germany presented the Labour Party with a difficult problem.

On the one hand, the reaction of the working class was a reaction of intense anger and hatred against Fascism, and a widespread spontaneous demand for a united working class front to fight the Fascist enemy.

On the other hand, the policy of British imperialism, which the Labour Party has invariably reflected, was to utilise the victory of Fascism in Germany in order to develop the anti-Soviet front and prepare a war of intervention.

How to combine these two opposites, and to divert the working class anti-Fascist feeling into channels of the anti-Soviet campaign ?

This was the problem which, in fact, faced the central leadership of the Labour Party.

The Labour Party leadership found their characteristic solution of this problem, and they found it directly from the arsenal of the Labour Party programme.

In the face of the challenge of Fascism, and in the face of the demand for the united working class front against Fascism, addressed directly to it by the Communist Party and by the Independent Labour Party, and supported by considerable sections within the Labour Party (Socialist League, "New Clarion," etc., as well as many trade union organisations), the Executive of the Labour Party and the General Council of the Trades Union Congress countered with a manifesto under the slogan :

"Democracy versus Dictatorship ! Labour's Call to the People."

What was the significance of this slogan ? Its whole significance lay in the substitution of the conceptions "*Working class front*" and "*Fascism*" by the conceptions "*Democracy*" and "*Dictatorship.*" This substitution gave the Labour Party leaders free play to deceive the workers and to tie them to the policy of British imperialism.

This slogan aimed at representing the dictatorship of the proletariat in the Soviet Union to be a power akin (also a dictatorship) to the bloody Fascist dictatorship over the working class. Thus, under the cover of "democratic" phraseology and anti-Fascist demagogy, in reality the fight was sharpened against the Soviet Union.

The slogan "Democracy versus Dictatorship" is the conscious device of the Labour Party leadership to transform the working class demand for the struggle against Fascism into the channels of the British imperialist struggle against Communism and against the Soviet Union.

The character of the manifesto and of the whole campaign which was conducted on its basis made this significance fully clear.

The manifesto was issued on March 25th—that is, at the height of the capitalist anti-Soviet campaign, and of the whole campaign around the trial of the British spies in the Soviet Union.

The manifesto appears to take up the issue of Fascism, only to translate it immediately into the issue of Communism. The dictatorship of the proletariat and the Fascist dictatorship are identified as forms of "dictatorship." "Communist dictatorship" or "the fear of working class dictatorship" is said to be the cause of the growth of Fascism. "Reaction of the ' Left ' is displaced by triumphant reaction of the ' Right.' " The workers are called on to support the Labour Party "against dictators—Fascist or Communist."

The brunt of the manifesto turns against Communism as a small but curious sect. It is noticeable that, while Fascism is referred to directly in the manifesto four times, Communism or Bolshevism is referred to directly seven times.

The widespread campaign which has been organised by the Labour Party throughout the country on this basis bears the same character. Typical is the statement of the Labour Member of Parliament, R. J. Davies, at a trade union conference :

> "So long as we have a dictatorship in Russia, Poland, Germany, Italy or elsewhere, the mere fact that they accept dictatorship brings in its train the other things that are happening in both Germany and Russia. . . . I would not suffer, if I could prevent it, dictatorship of the proletariat any more than the dictatorship of the capitalist class."

A central demonstration was organised at the Albert Hall, addressed by the principal Labour Party and trade union leaders. Of this demonstration a prominent ' Left ' Labour representative had to declare in disgust :

> "The Labour Party and trade union leaders even turned last week's Albert Hall demonstration more to a protest against Soviet Russia than against the Hitlerite dictatorship." (E. C. Wilkinson at the Distributive Workers' Conference : "New Leader," April 21st, 1933.)

This campaign has served in fact two purposes for the Labour Party leaders.

First, it has served to counter the demand for the united front and to sharpen the fight against the rising influence of Communism in the Labour ranks, while concealing the real issue sharply presented by Fascism to the working class.

Second—and this is, above all, important at the present point—it has served as a campaign of ideological war preparation against the Soviet Union.

The slogan "Democracy versus Dictatorship" employed, for instance, by the French Socialists for

the ideological justification of the war of imperialist France and its allies against Fascist Germany and Fascist Italy, acquires in England in the mouths of the leaders of the Labour Party, a heightened anti-Soviet flavour. *Now it is already the slogan of the future imperialist war against the Soviet Union.*

The greatest crime of the Labour Party and trade union leaders is that they are, at this critical hour, consciously endeavouring through this slogan, to incite the masses against the Soviet Union.

Current Labour propaganda literature already bears the character of the lower types of war propaganda. An example of this is the June issue of the official monthly organ, the "Labour Magazine." This organ bears for its frontispiece a combined setting of four heads—Stalin, Hitler, Mussolini, and Pilsudski. In the text Citrine, Secretary of the Trades Union Congress, notorious for his splitting activities in the unions and for his close relations with the big industrialists, writes of how "the Collectivist State, whether Communist or Fascist" has destroyed the trade unions: "In the Communist Revolution of October, 1917, a similar technique was applied to the trade unions as was used in Italy. . . . the independent unions were suppressed as Mussolini has suppressed the unions in Italy," etc. This is only a sample of what is being poured out on every side.

In the face of this infamous campaign of the Labour Party leadership, the opposition throughout the ranks of the Labour Party and of the trade unions is growing. Despite the official ban on participation, both the Anti-War Movement and the Anti-Fascist Movement are winning wide and increasing support within the working class organisations. The Anti-War Congress at Bermondsey in March was attended by 1,500 delegates, including 400 from the trade unions (including six National Executives) fifty from local Labour Parties, 110 from Co-operative Guilds, ninety-five from the Independent Labour Party. The Anti-Fascist Conference in London in May, although organised at shorter notice, united 440 delegates, including seventy from trade union branches, forty-four from local Labour Parties, and ninety from Co-operative Guilds.

The Labour Party and trade union central leadership have met this rising united front campaign by announcing a general "clean up"—that is, wholesale expulsions to destroy the working class united front, and maintain their own war campaigns against Communism and against the Soviet Union.

If this is the rôle of the Labour Party and trade union leadership already in time of peace, in time of nominal "friendly" relations with the Soviet Union, it can readily be imagined what their rôle will be when British imperialism will have let loose the dogs of war.

Against this also the working class must be prepared.

The fight against the menace of war on the Soviet Union cannot but be the fight against the infamous anti-Soviet war propaganda of the Labour Party leadership also, against the whole social-fascist propaganda of "Democracy versus Dictatorship."

XIIth PLENUM LIBRARY

1. Resolutions and Theses ... ... 2d. 5cts.
2. "Prepare for Power." (The International Situation and the tasks of the sections of the Communist International) ... ... 4d. 15cts.
   (Report by O. Kuusinen)
3. "War in Far East." (The Danger of Imperialist War and Military Intervention in connection with the War which has broken out in the Far East) 2d. 5cts.
   (Report by Okano. C.P. Japan)
4. The Soviet Union and the World's Workers ... ... 2d. 5cts.
   (Report by D. Z. Manuilsky, C.P.S.U.)
5. "Fulfil the Decisions." (The C.P.s of France and Germany and the tasks of the Communists in the Trade Unions) 2d. 5cts.
   (Report by O. Piatnitsky)
6. Great Britain, Ireland and America ... 2d. 5cts.
   (Speeches by Gusev, Pollitt, Troy and an American Comrade)
7. XIIth Plenum Handbook (Propagandists' Guide to the decisions of the XII Plenum) ... ... 4d. 10cts.

LENIN ON THE COMING NEW WORLD WAR

By MADYAR.

WE are living in a pre-war period. The tempo of the transition to the new cycle of revolu- and wars is accelerating. History has not yet en its last word, and it is hard to predict whether ertain countries the revolution will not precede imperialist war or intervention. As yet, history not spoken its last word and the question whether war in the imperialist camp will precede the rvention, or the intervention will precede the erialist war has not yet been decided. It is ous, however, that this decision approaches er and nearer.

We are living in a pre-war period.

When perusing the works of Lenin, one sees that Leninism has foreseen and predicted the elopment of things, and that only Leninism has n the world proletariat a correct orientation.

uring the first imperialist world war, the social avinists of the Second International and the y-bourgeois pacifists prattled a lot about a mocratic peace," about a "peace without annexa- s and reparations." During the world war Lenin ady foresaw and predicted :

(1) . . . "Thus also the peace ending the war an only be a registration of the shifting of power fected in the course of the war." (XII, 65*.)

nd Lenin also foresaw the effects of this imperial- obbery-peace on the situation of the working class: " . . . consequently, irrespective of the result of e war, the conclusion of peace can only determine worsening of the political and economic situation the masses—since the capitalist society remains." XIX, 65-66.)

nd it is precisely in view of this that Lenin ed the world proletariat before the world historic mma :

" . . . Either one helps its 'own' national ourgeoisie to rob foreign countries, calling this pport 'defence of the Fatherland,' or 'saving e home country,' or one helps to prepare for the cialist revolution of the proletariat."

enin foresaw and predicted that the leading erialist Powers did not prepare for a democratic ce without annexations or reparations, but for a world war for resharing the world :

"Two or three robbers (America, England, pan) of world power, and armed to the teeth, are aring the 'booty' and draw the whole world with em in *their* war for the division of *their* booty.' IX.)

nd Lenin has quite concretely predicted that the t bitter struggles between the imperialist robbers would flare up around the semi-colonies such as China and the countries of Central and South America.

"The struggle for the semi-dependent countries was obviously bound to acquire special acuteness in the epoch of banking capital, when the rest of the world had already been divided." (XIX, 161.)

The social-imperialists, the Social-Fascists-to-be, during the first world war and after the world war, with their slogan of disarmament, have deceived the working masses regarding the dangers of the coming war. Lenin has raised the question of disarmament also, and answered it as follows :

"Disarmament is the ideal of Socialism. In the Socialist society there will be no wars, and consequently disarmament will be realised. But he who expects the realisation of Socialism *without* a social revolution and dictatorship of the proletariat is not a Socialist." (XIX, 397.)

And even during the first world war, at a time when the petty-bourgeois pacifists and the present Social-Fascists were chattering about "the last war" and "an organised peace," driving the masses into the trenches with this promise, Lenin warned the world proletariat that the first world war was a preparation for a second world butchery :

"We will not ignore the tragic possibility that if the worst comes to the worst, mankind will even outlive a second imperialist war, should the revolution in spite of the repeated outbreaks of mass unrest and mass indignation, and in spite of our efforts, not yet be born out of the war." (XIX, 403.)

Moreover, Lenin has indicated quite specifically which imperialist antagonisms can and will lead to a new world disaster. As one of the decisive antagonisms in the camp of imperialism, Lenin indicated the struggle between Japan and the United States :

"The second antagonism, which is the determining factor for the international situation for Russia, is the rivalry between Japan and America. The economic development of these countries has, for several decades of years, accumulated a tremendous mass of explosive matter which renders a desperate struggle for the domination of the Pacific and its shores unavoidable. The whole diplomatic and economic history of the Far East leaves no room for doubt that on the basis of capitalism the sharp conflict ripening between Japan and America cannot be prevented." (XXIII, page 5.)

As the second contradiction which can and will lead to a new world butchery, Lenin indicated the antagonism between England and the United States :

*Russian Edition.

"England and France have won, but they are up to their ears in debt to America, who, ignoring the victor pose of the French and the English, is determined to skim the cream and to collect the interest and compound interest for the support granted during the war. To ensure this is the purpose of the American fleet at present under construction, which exceeds the English in size." (XXIV, page 546.)

"There are deeper causes for this, which are connected with the development of the interests of English imperialism which rules over an incredible number of colonies. In this respect a deeper antagonism exists between American and English imperialism, and it is our absolute duty to base ourselves upon this antagonism . . ." (XVI, 10.)

And as the third main antagonism in the camp of imperialism, Lenin indicated the struggle of Germany against Versailles :

"And the third conflict flares up between the Entente Powers and Germany. Germany is defeated, it has been fettered by the Versailles Treaty, but Germany has gigantic economic possibilities at her disposal. As far as economic development is concerned, Germany is the second country in the world, if the United States is considered the first country. And such a country was forced to accept the Versailles Treaty and within the scope of this treaty, Germany cannot live. Germany is one of the strongest and most progressive imperialist Powers, and it cannot tolerate the Versailles Treaty." (XXV, page 507.)

And Lenin has foreseen and predicted which rôle French imperialism will play in this :

"The new war which is being prepared between America and Japan (or England) and which in view of the shrinking of capitalism is inevitable, will unavoidably draw France in with it, France being involved in all imperialist crimes and barbarian felonies of our imperialist epoch. Either a new war, or a number of wars for the ' defence ' of French imperialism or socialist revolution—the workers and peasants of France have no other alternative." (XXVII, page 103.)

And besides the struggle of Germany against Versailles, Lenin sees the development of imperialist antagonism along the following lines :

"We witness the ever-accentuating enmity over the sharing of the booty obtained, between Italy and France, between France and England, between England and America, between America and Japan." (XXIII, page 495.)

And Lenin also predicted how, on this basis, the chauvinism and nationalism of the petty-bourgeois masses will be fanned :

"Whoever may win, Europe is threatened with a sharpening of ' revenge ' chauvinism, German or English militarism fans counter-chauvinism." (These lines were written by Lenin in September 1917.) (XXX, page 223.)

Lenin defined the Versailles peace as "the greatest blow which capitalism could give itself." But at the same time, he foresaw that the prattle about a peaceful revision of the Versailles Treaty is only a comedy, ' peaceful revision is a comedy,' Lenin wrote :

"The victory of the Entente and the Versailles peace has thrust back the great majority of German nations and put them into a position in which it is impossible to exist. The Versailles Treaty has created a situation in which Germany cannot dream of a breathing space, in which it cannot dream for a moment that it will not be robbed, that it will not be deprived of the means necessary to live, that its population will not be doomed to starvation and extinction." (XXVI, page 14.)

The revision, the real revision, which will not substitute one forcible peace for another, Lenin expects from the proletarian revolution :

" . . . Like the Brest peace for Germany, the Versailles peace will end for France and England with a defeat for the capitalists and victory of the proletariat." (XXIV, page 401.)

And he expects the real revision from the strengthening of the Soviet Union :

"The Soviet Union is a power which destroys the Versailles Treaty. If Soviet Russia is strengthened the Versailles Treaty will collapse, as was nearly the case in July, 1920, following the first blow by the Red Army." (XXV, page 524.)

And it is characteristic of the amazing farsightedness of Lenin that he has foreseen and predicted the rôle and significance of the so-called Polish Corridor.

"One of the suppositions of this monstrous peace is that Poland cuts Germany in two parts, because Poland needs a way out to the sea. The relations between Germany and Poland are very strained at present." (XXV, 498.)

It is but natural that Lenin does not only indicate the imperialist contradictions, which must lead to a new world butchery in the camp of imperialism, if this is not prevented by the revolution, but points out at the same time the new cycle of interventions against the Soviet Union :

"We do not only live in one State, but in a system of States, and the existence of the Soviet Republic side by side with the imperialist States is inconceivable for any considerable length of time. Eventually, one or the other must win." (XXIV, page 122.)

Lenin always emphasised the inevitability of the attempt on the part of the imperialist Powers to organise ever fresh acts of intervention against the land of Soviets. He wrote :

"The development of capitalism takes place, t

highest degree, unequally in different countries. could not be otherwise, under conditions of mmodity production. Hence, the irrefutable nclusion: Socialism cannot conquer simul-eously *in all* countries. It conquers first of all one or in a group of countries, but the remainder some time remain bourgeois or pre-bourgeois ntries. This is bound to evoke not merely a dency but the direct endeavour of the bour-isie of other countries to crush the victorious letariat of the Socialist State. In such cases, r on our part would be a lawful and just act. It uld be a war for Socialism, for the liberation of ner peoples from the bourgeoisie."

d Lenin also returned, time and again, to the ion whether an alliance of all imperialists against Soviet Union is possible, and whether such an ce could last for any length of time. He ered this question by pointing to the two world rical tendencies:

"Two tendencies exist: one which renders the iance of all imperialists unavoidable, a second ich drives one group of imperialists against the ner. Two tendencies neither of which rests on a m basis." (XXIII, page 6.)

d Lenin was of the opinion that the antagonisms e camp of the imperialists make a steady durable ce extremely difficult, if they do not make it even impossible.

"Up to now, we only succeeded in winning, nks to the profound disagreement between the perialist Powers and thanks to the circumstance t this disagreement was not an accidental, ernal party disagreement, but an extremely ential, irremovable discord of the economic erests of the imperialist countries which, being sed on private property of land and capital, not dispense with that robber policy in respect land and capital, cannot dispense with that ber policy in which their efforts towards uniting ir forces against the Soviet Government prove n." (XXVI, page 7.)

d Lenin predicted the failure of the interven-t bloc against the Soviet Union:

"The experience of world policy proves that an alliance against Soviet Russia is inevitably doomed to failure because it would be an imperialist alliance, an alliance of robbers who do not agree among each other, and who have no really lasting interests uniting them." (XXV, page 519.)

And the task of the policy of the Soviet Union Lenin considers to be to strengthen the forces of the Soviet Union and the world revolution, and to take advantage of the antagonisms in the camp of world imperialisms.

"... Hence our policy—to take advantage of the discord among the imperialist Powers, to render more difficult agreement between them, or if possible to render such agreement temporarily impossible." (XXVI, page 8.)

"... We have deprived the Entente of the support of its workers and the peasants, secondly we have achieved the neutrality of those small peoples who are their slaves and thirdly, we have started to deprive the Entente in its own countries of the support of the petty-bourgeoisie and the intellectual middle class who were quite biased against us." (XXIV, page 599.)

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Communist International, under the leadership of Comrade Stalin, have worked untiringly for the realisation of this bequest. To win over the workers and peasants of the imperialist Powers, to win the confidence of the small oppressed countries and the oppressed nations and countries, to obtain the sympathy of the petty-bourgeoisie and the intellectual middle class, to utilise the imperialist antagonisms in the interest of Socialist construction and the extension of peace, of the breathing space—this has been, and still is, the meaning of the policy of the Soviet Union. Up to now, she has been able to carry out this policy, because she was strong and powerful, because Socialist industrialisation and the Socialist reorganisation of agriculture have tremendously increased the power and force of the Soviet Union, because the peace policy of the Soviet Union was linked up with the realisation and carrying out of the First Five-Year Plan, and the beginning of the realisation and carrying out of the Second Five-Year Plan.

MARXISM VERSUS SOCIAL DEMOCRACY	Bela Kun	3d.	10
SOCIAL DEMOCRACY—STEPPING-STONE TO FASCISM	D. Z. Manuilsky	2d.	5
MARXISM—THE DOCTRINE OF PROLETARIAN DICTATORSHIP	D. Z. Manuilsky	2d.	5
WHY HITLER IN GERMANY?	Report of F. Heckert	2d.	5
THE MOSCOW TRIAL		3d.	10
KARL MARX	L. Perchik	3d.	10
WAR AGAIN TO-MORROW	Nemo	1d.	3
SOME URGENT PROBLEMS OF THE LABOUR MOVEMENT IN INDIA	V. Basak	2d.	5

SHORTLY

THE WORLD ECONOMIC CRISIS; AND THE TASKS OF SECTIONS OF THE COMINTERN	O. Piatnitsky		
POLAND ON THE ROAD TO REVOLUTIONARY CRISIS	J. Bratskolsky	2/6	9

Write to the Publishers of this Magazine for List.

PRINTED BY BLACKFRIARS PRESS, LTD., SMITH-DORRIEN ROAD, LEICESTER, ENG